

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-29 are pending in the application, with 1, 18, 21, 24 and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 18, and 21 are sought to be amended. Claims 24-29 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 5-9, 11 and 18-23 under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,456,334 to Duhault. (hereafter referred to as "Duhault").

Applicants seek to amend claim 1. Although, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, it is moot in light of the current Amendment.

Claim 1 as amended is directed to a channel selection canvas comprising: "a header field for displaying general information, wherein general information displays information based on a current condition."

The amendment finds support in the specification, for example, at FIG. 2, paragraph [0032], and paragraph [0036] ("...header field 232, which identifies that the canvas is Mike's Canvas. Header field 232 also provides the date, time, and current weather conditions").

Duhault nowhere teaches or suggests a channel selection canvas with a header field for displaying information based on a current condition.

Duhault discloses a video display window displaying multiple video images (See Col. 2 lines 16-59). Duhault discloses where a video window has a "window header." However, Duhault is silent with regards to if any information is displayed in "window header." Based on the Figs. 1-4 and the description of video windows in Duhault, it seems that the "window header" in Duhault is simply used to enable window scalability similar to a title bar in known windowed GUIs. Thus, "window header" in Duhault cannot be said to display any information, let alone information that is based on a current condition.

Since, Duhault does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1, Duhault cannot anticipate that claim. Applicants submit that dependent claims 5-9 and 11 are also not anticipated by Duhault for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 5-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) are traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants seek to amend claim 18. Although, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 18, it is moot in light of the current Amendment.

Claim 18 as amended is directed to a channel selection canvas generator, comprising: "an administrative engine for storing user preferences and controlling the

overall operation of the channel selection canvas generator, wherein user preference information includes a user's favorite channels for a given time period"

The amendment finds support in the specification at paragraph [0033].

Duhault nowhere teaches or suggests "an administrative engine for storing user preferences and controlling the overall operation of the channel selection canvas generator, wherein user preference information includes a user's favorite channels for a given time."

Since, Duhault does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 18, Duhault cannot anticipate that claim. Applicants submit that dependent claims 19-20 are also not anticipated by Duhault for at least the same reasons as independent claim 18 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features.

Applicants seek to amend claim 21. Although, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 21, it is moot in light of the current Amendment.

Claim 21 as amended is directed to a method for providing a channel selection canvas to video display device, comprising: "gathering user preference information related to the channel selection canvas, wherein user preference information includes information related to a user's favorite channels for a given time period."

The amendment finds support in the specification at paragraph [0033].

Duhault nowhere teaches or suggests "gathering user preference information related to the channel selection canvas, wherein user preference information includes a user's favorite channels for a given time."

Since, Duhault does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 21, Duhault cannot anticipate that claim. Applicants submit that dependent claims 22-23 are also not anticipated by Duhault for at least the same reasons as independent claim 21 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner has rejected claims 2-4, 15 and 16 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,456,334 to Duhault.

Claims 2-4, 15 and 16 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore incorporate the features recited in claim 1. As noted above, Duhault does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. For at least this reason, dependent claims 2-4, 15 and 16 are not obvious in view of Duhault. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-4, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The examiner has rejected claims 10, 12-14 and 17 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,456,334 to Duhault in view of the Background of the instant application.

Claims 10, 12-14 and 17 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore incorporate the features recited in claim 1. As noted above, Duhault does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. For at least this reason, dependent claims 10, 12-14 and 17 are not obvious in view of Duhault.

Further, the Examiner has mischaracterized what the Background of the present application discloses as known in the art at the time the invention was made.

The Background of the present application simply describes: "guides [that] typically provide a scrolling list of channels that identify the channel number and programming information" and "services [that] allow a user to jump to a particular channel in a selection guide." An example of one these known guides is shown in Fig. 1 of US Patent 6,857,128 Borden et al. cited by the Examiner. As described in the Background of the present application "these guides remain limited in that they typically show only the channel and title of the show." The Background of the present application simply discloses displaying programming information in a list and does not disclose a channel selection field for displaying a plurality of television channel video thumbnails and programming information for each television channel video thumbnail.

Further, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Duhault with the teaching of displaying programming information in a list to create a channel selection field for displaying a plurality of television channel video thumbnails and programming information for each television channel video thumbnail. Duhault is primarily concerned with solving the problem of prior art picture-in-picture systems that superimpose one small image on top of one large image (See Col. 1 lines 20-45). Duhault attempts to solve the problems of prior art picture-in-picture systems by maximizing the number/size of video images that are displayed (See Figs. 1-4 of Duhault). Duhault does not teach or suggest identifying video thumbnails.

Moreover, Duhault teaches away from the present invention in that Duhault teaches maximizing the amount of display area dedicated to video images. Such an

approach thwarts a fundamental purpose of the present invention to include ancillary information regarding the video displays and other information. Thus, Duhault teaches away from the use of identifiers and can not be used in combination with any other reference to render the claims of the present invention obvious. For at least this reason and the reasons provided above, dependent claims 10, 12-14 and 17 are not obvious from the combination of Duhault and the Background of the present application. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 10, 12-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 24-25 relate to, at least, a video selection canvas for display on a video display device, comprising: a video selection field for displaying a list of a plurality of selectable video entry rows, wherein each of selectable video entry rows includes a video thumbnail and associated text information identifying the video thumbnail. Claims 24-25 find support in the specification, for example, at FIG. 2. Duhault does not disclose a video selection field for displaying a list of a plurality of selectable video entry rows, wherein each of selectable video entry rows includes a video thumbnail and associated text information identifying the video thumbnail. For at least this reason claims 24-25 are believed to be allowable over Duhault.

Claims 26-29 relate to at least a video processing system configured to display the channel selection canvas of claim 1. Claims 26-29 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Specht
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,463

Date: 9/12/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

690655_2.DOC